

REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8, and added claims 14-20. Claims 1 through 20 are presented for examination.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge Examiner's conclusion that claims 3-8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have amended claims 3 and 7 placing each in independent form including all the features of their respective base claim and any intervening claims. Each of claims 4-6 and 8 depend from claim 3 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 2 and 9 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,147,574 (Kidoh). Claims 12 and 13 were rejected as being unpatentable over Kidoh. As shown above, Applicant has amended independent claim 1. As amended, claim 1 covers surface acoustic wave filters that include a first acoustic track and a second acoustic track that are arranged such that respective surface acoustic wave propagation directions of the first acoustic track and the second acoustic track are parallel to each other. In view of these amendments, withdrawal of the art rejections is respectfully requested.

In this regard, the Office action (page 2) apparently equates the input-side unidirectional transducer (12) and the output-side unidirectional transducer (13) of Kidoh, Fig. 1, to the first

and second acoustic tracks of the claims. However, Kidoh still fails to disclose or render obvious a first acoustic track and a second acoustic track that are arranged in parallel such that respective surface acoustic wave propagation directions of the first acoustic track and the second acoustic track are parallel to each other. To the contrary, according to Kidoh, the output-side unidirectional transducer is arranged to extend in a direction in which a surface acoustic wave excited by the input-side unidirectional transducer propagates.<sup>1</sup> That is, the input-side and output-side unidirectional transducers of Kidoh are arranged such that their respective surface acoustic wave propagation directions are in line with each other instead of a parallel arrangement as required by the amended claim 1.

In view of the forgoing discussion, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 9 as anticipated by Kidoh, and the rejection of claims 12 and 13 as unpatentable over Kidoh.

Claim 10 was rejected as being unpatentable over Kidoh in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,929,723 (Kimura). Claim 10 depends from claim 1, and thus is patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Kimura, relied on for its teaching of an apparatus using an aluminum alloy for electrode for the purpose of connecting circuitry, does not remedy the deficiencies of Kidoh, as discussed above.

In view of the forgoing discussion, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 as unpatentable over Kidoh in view of Kimura.

Claim 11 was rejected as being unpatentable over Kidoh in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,147,574 (Misawa). The Office action (page 3) apparently cites Misawa for disclosing "a SAW

---

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., col. 2, lines 44-48; see also col. 4, lines 5-10

device that is flip chip mounted," and suggests that "[i]t would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have mounted the SAW filter of Kidoh in a flip chip arrangement as taught by Misawa for the purpose of saving space."

However, even assuming, without conceding, that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have thought to modify Kidoh's SAW filter by mounting the SAW filter in a flip chip arrangement as taught by Misawa, the resulting device still would not provide a first acoustic track and a second acoustic track that are arranged in parallel such that respective surface acoustic wave propagation directions of the first acoustic track and the second acoustic track are parallel to each other, as required by Applicants' claim 1. Nor would a person of ordinary skill in the art have modified the resulting device to provide such an arrangement.

In view of the forgoing discussion, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 as unpatentable over Kidoh in view of Misawa.

Each of the dependent claims is believed to define patentable features of the invention. Each dependent claim partakes of the novelty of its corresponding independent claim, in light of the foregoing amendments, and, as such, has not been discussed specifically herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this

Applicant : Pitschi, et al.  
Serial No. : 10/559,508  
Filed : May 26, 2006  
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 14219-0109US1 / P2003,0316  
US N


paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Please charge any additional fees, not already covered by check, or credit any overpayment, to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 14219-109US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 28, 2008



Timothy M. Bryan  
Reg. No. 62,791

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945